

The Examiner states, in response to Applicant's previous amendment, that Yeh discloses, among other things, a protrusion (21) formed at the front face for selective engagement with a cooperating tool, whereby torque is applied directly to the protrusion to rotate the connector body with respect to the output port. Applicant disagrees.

Element 21 of Yeh is not a "protrusion" in the sense used in the present Application. Element 21 of Yeh is, instead, a saw tooth portion. One might argue that the saw tooth protrudes inwardly from the circumference of drive pipe 20 of Yeh, thereby constituting a protrusion, but this is not at all the protrusion of the present Application. Applicant directs the Examiner to element 25 of the present invention, which is a formed at the front face of connector body 20. Nevertheless, in the interest of expediency, Applicant has further amended claim 1 to include the limitation that the protrusion extend along a longitudinal axis of the connector body. Even if the saw tooth portions of Yeh are considered protrusions, they certainly do not extend from the front face along a longitudinal axis of the device. Thus, in view of the instant amendment, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Yeh.

Claims 12 and 22 of the present Application have been similarly amended to provide that the protrusion extend from the front face along a longitudinal axis of the connector body. No new matter has been added with these amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-6, 9, 10, 23-27, and 30-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeh in view of Doan et al. Applicant notes that the Examiner's rejections of these claims have been rendered moot by Applicant's amendments to the claims contained herein. Each of these claims is dependent, ultimately, upon either of claims 1, or 22,

both of which have been amended as described above. Because, for the reasons given above, Yeh does not disclose each and every element of the claims of the present Application, as currently amended, claims 2-6, 9, 10, 23-27, and 30-36 are allowable dependent claims depending from patentable base claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeh in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,011,422, issued to Yeh. Applicant notes that the Examiner's rejections of these claims have been rendered moot by Applicant's amendments to the claims contained herein. Each of these claims is dependent, ultimately, upon either of claims 1 or 22, both of which have been amended as described above. Because, for the reasons given above, Yeh does not disclose each and every element of the claims of the present Application, as currently amended, claims 7 and 28 are allowable dependent claims depending from patentable base claims.

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doan et al. Applicant notes that the Examiner's rejections of these claims have been rendered moot by Applicant's amendments to the claims contained herein. Claim 20 is dependent, ultimately, upon claim 12, which has been amended as described above. Because claim 12 is allowable, for the reasons provided above (and with respect to claim 12 below), claim 20 of the present Application constitutes an allowable dependency depending from a patentable base claim.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 12, 14-18, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doan et al. The Examiner states that the recitation of the manner in which the claimed apparatus is intended to be employed is not sufficient to differentiate the claimed apparatus from the prior art. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Particularly in light of

the instant amendments, the current claim 12 of the present application does not merely recite an intended use in the abstract. Rather, claim 12 presents specific structural limitation in reciting the claimed use. Because these structural limitations are included in the recitation of the intended use of the present device, Applicant submits that the present device is sufficiently differentiated from the prior art because of these structural recitations. Thus, the present case is distinguished from that of *Ex parte Masham*. Claims 14-18, 19, and 21 all depend, ultimately, from claim 12 and are therefore allowable dependent claims depending from a patentable base claim.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that all claims currently pending in the present application, namely claims 1-12 and 14-36, are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the same. No new matter has been added in the current amendments.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

May 1, 2006

By: _____


R. Scott Kimsey
Reg. No. 50195

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
PO Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(816) 460-2400